

## REMARKS

### OVERVIEW

Claims 33-37 are pending in this application. Claims 33-37 are new. Claims 26-32 have been cancelled. The present response is an earnest effort to place all claims in proper form for immediate allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### ABSTRACT

The Examiner has suggested on page 2 of the Office Action of March 6, 2002, to change the amendment to refer to a method. Therefore, it would appear that no further amendment to the abstract would be needed. However, if the Examiner disagrees, it is requested that the Examiner provide a more detailed explanation for the suggestion.

### NEW CLAIMS

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which the Applicant regards as the invention. New claim 33 corresponds largely with previously submitted claims 26 and 32 which are now cancelled. It is noted that in the first step of claim 33 it is called for "separating" the first chip resistor from the second chip resistor. The step of separating is shown in the drawings (i.e. Figure 1), and in the written specification, such as in paragraph 28 that explains that the encapsulant provides the advantage of insulating the power chip resistor 10 without concern for long term instability such as may be caused by resistive heating. It is also noted that each chip resistor specifically includes first and second end caps, support for which is found in paragraph 27 of the application which calls out electrical terminals or end caps 14. The alumina substrate of claim 34 and the ruthenium oxide resistive element of claim 35 are supported by paragraph 26 of the application.

The standard size of 0.250 inches of claim 36 is supported by the specification in paragraph 32. The nickel plating of the metal barrier of claim 37 is supported by paragraph 29. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are well supported by the specification as originally filed and no new matter has been introduced.

ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 26, 29, 31, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 4,267,634 to Wellard. Although the rejections are technically moot, it should be appreciated that claim 33 is significantly different than Wellard. In particular, claim 33 requires a first and a second "chip resistor". Each chip resistor includes a substrate, end caps on the substrate, and a resistive element on the substrate between the end caps. This is not disclosed in Wellard. Wellard merely discloses alternating resistive and ceramic layers. That is not the Applicants' invention of claim 33. Rather, the invention of claim 33 uses separated chip resistors. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 33-37 are patentably distinguishable from Wellard and that the previously submitted claims were also distinguishable from Wellard as they also required connecting a "first chip resistor" and a "second chip resistor."


It is also noted that the barriers of the power chip resistors of the present invention are used "to mechanically connect the first and second chip resistors." This provides an advantage over relying upon epoxy or another adherence in that even though there is resistive heating, long term mechanical stability is provided.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should find the claims allowable.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN D, GOODHUE, Reg. No. 47,603  
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721  
Phone No: (515) 288-3667  
Fax No: (515) 288-1338  
**CUSTOMER NO: 22885**

Attorneys of Record

- mlw -

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**SEP 11 2003**

**OFFICIAL**